



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,845	03/30/2004	Christophe Gouthier	116598-00114	2328
27557	7590	08/10/2006	EXAMINER	
BLANK ROME LLP 600 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20037				HINZE, LEO T
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2854		

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/811,845	GOUTHIER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Leo T. Hinze	2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 12 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 12 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 2854

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. Regarding claims 3 and 12, the claims contain the limitation that said luminous elements are lodged in blind hollows made in said substrate and open towards said semi-transparent layer. This limitation conflicts with the limitations in claims 1 and 10, the respective parent claims, which state that said luminous elements are lodged in blind hollows made in said semi-transparent layer and open towards said substrate plate.

b. Because of these conflicting limitations, the examiner has not applied art to claims 3 and 12.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1 and 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lange, US

Art Unit: 2854

2,885,561 (hereinafter Lange).

- a. Regarding claims 1 and 10, Lange teaches a dial, comprising: a substrate plate (45, Fig. 12); a semi-transparent layer (17, 30, Fig. 12) covering at least part of said substrate plate of a material allowing light to pass; phosphorescent, fluorescent or luminescent luminous elements (20, Fig. 12) lodged between said substrate plate and said semi-transparent layer; wherein said luminous elements form an image visible in darkness but essentially invisible under normal lighting conditions (col. 1, ll. 38-45).
- b. Regarding claim 4, Lange teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above. Lange also teaches the same structure that would result if said luminous elements were applied by serigraphy, tampography or manually onto said substrate plate and/or onto said semi-transparent layer. Applicant should note that even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. See MPEP § 2113.
- c. Regarding claim 5, Lange teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above. Lange also teaches wherein said semi-transparent layer is made of plastic ("synthetic resin," col. 5, ll. 1-2).
- d. Regarding claim 6, Lange teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above. Lange also teaches a colored layer (30, Fig. 12) interposed between said substrate plate and said semi-transparent layer.

Art Unit: 2854

e. Regarding claim 7, Lange teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 6 above. Lange also teaches wherein said colored layer is a coat of varnish ("translucent brilliant varnish base," col. 3, ll. 4-5).

f. Regarding claim 8, Lange teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above. Lange also teaches the same structure that would result if said blind hollows were made by machining or by selective chemical attack. Applicant should note that even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. See MPEP § 2113.

g. Regarding claim 9, Lange teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 3 above. Lange also teaches the same structure that would result if said blind hollows were made by machining or by selective chemical attack. Applicant should note that even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. See MPEP § 2113.

*Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-10 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2854

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leo T. Hinze whose telephone number is (571) 272-2167. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



**REN YAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Leo T. Hinze  
Patent Examiner  
AU 2854  
03 August 2006